DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 268 914 HE 019 281

AUTHOR	Petrovich, Janice; Hexter, Holly
TITLE	Campus Approaches to Faculty Retraining.
INSTITUTION	American Council on Education, Washington, D.C. Div. of Policy Analysis and Research.
PUB DATE	Feb 86
NOTE	52p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Council on Education, Division of Policy Analysis and Research, One Dupont Circle, NW, Washington, DC 20036-1193 ($8.00, nonmembers; $5.00, members).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reference Materials - Directories/Catalogs (132)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Collective Bargaining; *College Faculty; Contracts; Faculty Development; Guidelines; Higher Education; *Personnel Policy; Private Colleges; *Professional Development; Program Descriptions; Public Colleges; *Retraining; State Colleges; Statewide Planning; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	California State University; California State University Long Beach; Cheyney University PA; City University of New York; *Faculty Vitality; Kean College of New Jersey; Montana University System; Northern Illinois University; State University of New York; University of Tennessee Martin; University of Wisconsin

ABSTRACT

The background, content, and funding of faculty retraining activities at 17 colleges and universities are discussed. An overview covers characteristics of retraining programs and whether they are successful. For the 17 college/university programs, information is provided on: title, background, purpose, elements, funding, outcomes, and contact person with address and phone number. For four of the institutions, collective bargaining contracts or statements of institutional policies are included. These cover faculty development plans, career development funding guidelines, and guidelines for retraining. The sample of institutions includes statewide systems, public and private four-year institutions, and public two-year institutions. The specific institutions are: California State University, Montana State University System, State University of New York, University of Wisconsin, California State University at Long Beach, Cheyney University, City University of New York, Kean College, Northern Illinois University, University of Tennessee at Martin, Western Michigan University, Beloit College, College of St. Scholastica, Mars Hill College, Mary College, Los Angeles Community College, and Monroe Community College. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED268914

CAMPUS APPROACHES TO FACULTY RETRAINING

February 1986

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
American Council on Education
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
Division of Policy Analysis and Research
One Dupont Circle
Washington, D.C. 20036

NE 019 281

This report is not copyrighted. It may be reproduced in whole or in part in the interest of education.

To request copies, please send a check, payable to the American Council on Education, to:

Division of Policy Analysis and Research
American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-1193

$5.00/copy (ACE Members)
$8.00/copy (Non-ACE Members)

Please enclose a self-addressed mailing label.

Sorry, we cannot accept purchase orders. Prepaid orders only.

For 20 copies or more, please inquire at (202)939-9450.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Robert H. Atwell, President

The American Council on Education, founded in 1918, is a major national association serving higher education.

Foreword

Financial and demographic pressures on campuses have led to renewed attention to strategies for dealing with issues of faculty staffing. Faculty retraining programs are one example of these strategies; others include the development of early retirement plans and new policies for part-time faculty. Still other approaches have been developed to promote faculty vitality and academic quality.

A number of colleges and universities have conceived and implemented retraining plans that will allow the faculty member to take on new responsibilities within the institution. Other campuses may be considering the possibility. The following program descriptions and resource materials have been prepared to assist college administrators in this process. They provide information on the background, content, and funding of retraining activities in 17 colleges and universities.

Janice Petrovich, director of research studies at the American Council on Education at the time this publication was prepared, is now director of the Aspira Institute for Educational Policy Research. Holly Hexter is a research associate at ACE.

We are grateful to administrators and faculty of the institutions represented here for their time and help in preparing this publication. In addition, several reviewers provided thoughtful suggestions: Jack Schuster, professor of education at Claremont Graduate School; Evelyn Hively, director of the Academic Affairs Resource Center at the American Association of State Colleges and Universities; John Bennett, director of the Department Leadership Program at the American Council on Education, and Robert Armour of the Center for Educational Development and Faculty Resources at Virginia Commonwealth University.

Elaine El-Khawas
Vice President for
Policy Analysis
and Research

Table of Contents

Page

Foreword i

Part I. Overview 1

Part II. Resources 5

Part III. Program Summaries. 7

Part IV. Program Descriptions. 11
Statewide Systems 13
California State University, Montana State University System, State University of New York, University of Wisconsin

Public Four-year Institutions 17
California State University at Long Beach, Cheyney University, City University of New York, Kean College, Northern Illinois University, University of Tennessee at Martin, Western Michigan University

Independent Four-year Institutions. 28
Beloit College, College of St. Scholastica, Mars Hill College, Mary College

Public Two-year Institutions. 32
Los Angeles Community College, Monroe Community College

Part V. Institutional Policies, Contracts. 35

Faculty Development Plan, Northern Illinois University
Guidelines for Retraining, University of Wisconsin System
Career Development Funding Guidelines, Kean College
Excerpt of Bargaining Agreement, Western Michigan University and the American Association of University Professors

I. Overview

Efforts to revitalize faculty are hardly new. Many colleges have recognized the need to assist the instructor wishing to explore new teaching techniques, the mid-career professor who is seriously questioning his or her commitment to academe, or the senior faculty member whose field is changing rapidly and who needs to retool. Opportunities for informal training and personal and professional renewal are now quite common.

What has changed is the definition of faculty development and the types of activities offered under its rubric. Whereas faculty development programs traditionally have emphasized instructional development -- improving teaching and upgrading skills, generally within one's discipline -- more recent approaches focus on professional and organizational development. Of particular interest for this report are the retraining and renewal programs that are designed to prepare faculty participants for altogether new roles and responsibilities within the academic institution.

Retraining programs have developed in response to a variety of changes affecting higher education. The expansion of postsecondary education and the sizable growth of the professoriate in the 1960s had left many campuses with a relatively young, heavily-tenured faculty whose training sometimes diverged widely from the demands of incoming students.

Shifts in students' curricular interests and consequently in institutions' staffing needs stemmed from other developments. The clamor for new skills to support the nation's technological base, in concert with students' predilection for preprofessional study, has fueled a growing demand for business, engineering, and computer science training. On many campuses, the demand for remedial instruction has also grown dramatically. At the same time, enrollments in the humanities and the social sciences have slackened. Thus, many campuses have undertaken retraining to move humanities and social science faculty into higher-demand areas.

Economic and financial pressures have also helped shape faculty development. As patterns of enrollment changed, or when financial crises loomed, faculty development programs took a decidedly different turn. In some cases, colleges and universities retrenched drastically, resulting in the loss of jobs and lowered faculty morale. The training or retraining of existing faculty thus became a vehicle for preventing further layoffs, promoting flexibility in staffing, and encouraging faculty to broaden or change specialization in response to these external pressures.

In most cases, campus retraining programs have sprung up in response to temporary pressures and have had, or were expected to have, a short life. As the fiscal crisis abated, or as the need for new specialists was filled, the urgency for retraining often has diminished. In Florida, for instance, the state supported retraining of faculty at public institutions in the late 1970s; those efforts were phased out as financial conditions improved.

Who Supports Faculty Retraining?

According to the American Council on Education's latest Campus Trends survey, about two-fifths of the institutions surveyed reported having procedures to retrain faculty, although proportionately more two-year institutions and fewer four-year institutions had such procedures (El-Khawas, forthcoming). A survey of four-year colleges and universities by the Center for the Study of Higher Education at Pennsylvania State University found that public institutions were more likely than private institutions (25 percent compared with 13 percent) and unionized campuses more likely than nonunionized campuses (36 percent compared with 15 percent) to support faculty retraining (Mortimer et al, 1985).

This report provides a description of faculty retraining programs at several institutions and university systems. It also includes samples of program guidelines, retraining plans, and relevant portions of faculty bargaining agreements. A matrix summary provides the principal features of the programs at a glance.

Many of these programs have been cited elsewhere in the faculty development literature. Others have been identified as a result of informal surveying. The group of programs spans the range of institutional type and geographical location.

The campus programs described here support efforts by faculty to acquire new skills and roles within their institutions. The overarching objectives have been to provide greater flexibility in staffing, to retain faculty, and to preserve or generate desired expertise. This report does not examine efforts to aid faculty in seeking new careers outside academe.

Characteristics of Retraining Programs

If there is any generalization applicable to American higher education, it is that generalizations are hard to come by. Just as institutions of higher education are diverse, so too are efforts to develop effective retraining programs. Accordingly, while some patterns are discernible, the variations among them are striking. Nevertheless, the available evidence supports the following propositions:

- The purposes of retraining vary widely.

Retraining may be intended to prepare faculty to teach in areas allied to their primary specialization or in different areas altogether. The retraining may result in the loan of a faculty member to another department or program on a part-time basis or a permanent transfer from the home department.

- The content of retraining also varies.

Retraining activities range from intensive preparation for teaching an entry-level course in a related field to the pursuit of another degree.

- Participation in retraining is generally voluntary.

Only rarely does an institution dictate the content of retraining and require faculty members to participate. Where colleges have formally linked retraining to institutional needs, and identified overstaffing, the academic officer, dean, or department chair may strongly encourage faculty participation, and the receiving department usually sets standards for entry. Nevertheless, some institutions offered retraining to faculty members in departments targeted for retrenchment; in those cases, participation was not wholly voluntary.

- Typically, there is an agreement concerning the retraining plan and its outcome.

Formally or informally, all the players negotiate the course of training, its objective, and the obligations of the participant and the academic units involved. The content may be determined by the faculty member or the institution. Several colleges have required some assurance of continued service so that faculty don't "take the training and run." In turn, the college agrees (although rarely guarantees) that upon completion of training, the faculty member will be allowed to teach in that area.

- Faculty members generally do not forfeit status upon moving into a different academic department.

Faculty members who transfer to another department generally retain tenure, rank and salary. In many cases, questions of tenure and promotion are negotiated by the faculty member, the receiving department, and the institution.

- Funding may be internal or external; support may range from partial released time to full support for study and/or training.

Some foundations--Exxon, Northwest Area Foundation, Hewlett, and Mellon, among others--have funded retraining activities. Some programs concentrate resources on a few people--as, for instance, Northern Illinois, which may commit more than $7,000 per year per participating faculty member--while other programs provide limited support for a larger group of faculty. In some institutions, faculty retraining has been confined to college support for released time and educational expenses for a small number of faculty members. Elsewhere, a more ambitious goal may require dozens of humanities faculty to teach outside their specialty and entail a proportionately larger financial commitment.

How Successful Is Retraining?

While few formal evaluations of faculty retraining programs exist, it does appear that in many -- perhaps most-- cases the programs have met the goals of providing the flexibility to respond to enrollment shifts, giving faculty careers a new lease, and saving jobs. "It's given us the flexibility to meet changing student demands, particularly in computing and business areas," reported one administrator.

Retraining has been most effective, according to administrators, when faculty have been intimately involved in the development of a retraining plan and when the cooperation of all academic officials is secured from the beginning. Some administrators feel that faculty-administered retraining programs in which faculty participation is voluntary are the most successful. The presence of high-level administrative support is also viewed as essential to the credibility of a retraining program. Some say that the more closely related the area of training, the more likely it is that retraining will be successful.

In short, the programs described here demonstrate that retraining can take place in a way that mutually benefits faculty and institutions. Some of those interviewed indicated that faculty development is most effective when it is tied to institutional goals and long-range planning.

II. Resources

Roger J. Baldwin, ed., Incentives for Faculty Vitality (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985).

Roger J. Baldwin, Louis Brakeman, Russell Edgerton, Janet Hagberg, Thomas Maher, Expanding Faculty Options: Career Development Projects at Colleges and Universities (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1981).

Elaine El-Khawas, Campus Trends, 1985 (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, forthcoming). Copies will be available for $5 for ACE members and $8 for nonmembers from the Higher Education Panel, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.

Faculty Development at the Colleges of The City University of New York: A Status Report, July 1985.

Kenneth P. Mortimer, Marque Bagshaw, Andrew T. Masland, Flexibility in Academic Staffing: Effective Policies and Practices (Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education and the Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1985).

William C. Nelsen, Renewal of the Teacher Scholar (Washington, D.C: Association of American Colleges, 1981).

L. Terry Oggel and Edwin L. Simpson, "Personal Consultation and Contractual Planning in Stimulating Faculty Growth: The Faculty Development Program at Northern Illinois University," in To Improve the Academy: Resources for Student, Faculty, and Institutional Development (Orinda, CA: Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education, 1983).

R. Eugene Rice, Faculty Lives: Vitality and Change (St. Paul: Northwest Area Foundation, 1985).

Edwin L. Simpson and L. Terry Oggel, "The Development of Faculty Development," in Northern Illinois University Faculty Bulletin, Vol.45, No. 6, May 1982.

Carol Payne Smith and Ronald A. Crowell, "Collective Bargaining as a Springboard to Faculty Development," in California Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 8, No. 4, 1981.

III. Program Summaries

PROGRAM SUMMARY OF FACULTY RETRAINING PROGRAMS

Program Title	Purpose	Elements	Funding	Outcomes
Northern Illinois University Faculty Development Program	Develop faculty skills in a new area	Support for released time, transportation, living expenses and/or tuition	University	40 faculty have participated over the past past four years
City University of New York Faculty Development Program	Develop faculty skills in high-demand areas, such as computer science and remedial instruction	Program of instruction in writing and computing in the humanities and social sciences; provides released time	University	140 faculty have participated; many have gone on to teach in new areas
Beloit College	Develop faculty skills in high-priority areas set by college	Support for course development and summer graduate study, conference and travel	Hewlett and Mellon funds; college	50 faculty have participated
Montana University System Faculty Vitality Project	Retrain faculty in overstaffed areas for reassignment to departments in greater need	Released time and/or tuition support for course work within the system	Northwest Area Foundation	3 faculty members participated
Monroe Community College	Retrain faculty in overstaffed areas for reassignment to other departments	Released time and tuition reimbursement	College	10 faculty members have been retrained
University of Wisconsin Faculty Development Program	Develop faculty skills in related areas to help meet curricular demand	Support for tuition, released time, travel, and supplies for study	System grant and campus matching funds	40 to 50 faculty participate each year
University of Tennessee at Martin Academic Redirection Program	Develop faculty skills in high-demand areas	Support for tuition, travel, and teaching replacements	University and U.S. Department of Education	15 faculty members have participated
Kean College	Develop faculty skills in high-demand areas	Program of instruction in computer and management sciences. Also, paid leave, released time, and tuition reimbursement for career development	State and college	50 faculty have been prepared to teach outside their department
Western Michigan University Faculty Development Program	Develop faculty skills in new areas	Support for short courses, summer institutes, and graduate study	University	40-50 faculty have participated and teach in secondary areas
Mary College Reeducation of Faculty Project	Develop faculty skills in understaffed areas such as business and accounting	Support for graduate study, workshops, conferences, and self-directed study	Northwest Area Foundation	12 faculty members participated and now teach in secondary areas
College of St. Scholastica Faculty Vitality Program	Develop faculty skills in high-demand fields such as health sciences and business	Support for summer study	Northwest Area and Bush Foundations	7 faculty members participated
State University of New York Retraining Fellowship Program	Retrain faculty subject to layoff or in high-risk areas	Support for tuition, relocation, travel, supplies, and living expenses for study in SUNY or elsewhere	State	Program has not been formally evaluated

PROGRAM SUMMARY OF FACULTY RETRAINING PROGRAMS

Program Title	Purpose	Elements	Funding	Outcomes
California State University, Long Beach Faculty Retraining Project	Develop faculty skills in high-demand areas such as remedial instruction	Instruction in four subjects and released time	State	25 faculty members participated; 16 were certified to teach in a new department
Mars Hill College	Develop faculty skills in understaffed fields of gerontology, computer science	Support for graduate study; teaching replacements	Exxon Education Foundation	9 faculty members participated
Los Angeles Community College District	Retrain faculty in overstaffed areas, such as physical education, to teach in other areas	Support for tuition, released time, travel, and supplies	College	17 faculty members are participating
Cheyney University	Increase number of faculty with terminal degrees and develop faculty skills in business and technical fields	Support for graduate study toward a degree locally or elsewhere	Commonwealth of Pennsylvania	Nine faculty are participating
California State University System Faculty Retraining Grant Program	Develop faculty skills in "hard to-hire" fields such as engineering, business and computer science	Released time and suport for teaching assistants for	State	Faculty at eight Cal State campuses are participating

IV. Program Descriptions

California State University System

Faculty Retraining Grant Program

Background California State University is a multicampus public institution that enrolls 316,000 students and has 11,389 full-time faculty, of whom 75 percent are tenured. Recognizing the need for more faculty to teach in high-demand, "hard-to-hire" disciplines such as engineering, business and computer science, and based on the experience of Long Beach and other campuses, the system obtained state funds beginning in the 1985-86 academic year to supplement campus resources.

Program The system solicits proposals from all 19 campuses. After the proposals have been screened at the campus level, they are reviewed by a screening committee of system officials and campus administrators. According to the associate dean of faculty affairs, a major criterion for the first year of support was the readiness to implement retraining activities. The program is aimed at compensating campuses for released time and funding for faculty mentors to prepare faculty to teach in what the system has identified as "hard-to-hire" disciplines -- engineering, business, and computer sciences -- as well as basic composition and basic math.

Funding The Cal State system is devoting $250,000 a year to the faculty retraining program.

Outcomes In the 1985-86 school year, eight campuses have been awarded grants under the faculty retraining grant program, which is now a line item in the state's budget for Cal State. The expectation is that faculty participating in retraining activities will be able to teach new courses at the beginning of the 1986-87 academic year. The system will evaluate the program in the second year.

For More Information Contact Dorothy Miller, Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs, Office of Faculty and Staff Relations, Office of the Chancellor, California State University System, 400 Golden Shore, Long Beach, Calif. 90802, (213)590-5506.

Montana University System

Faculty Vitality Project

Background The Montana University System is a public, multicampus institution that enrolls more than 30,000 students and has 1,613 full-time faculty. In 1980-81, the Montana system won a three-year grant from the Northwest Area Foundation to improve faculty vitality on its six campuses. Retraining was one component of the project. At the time, faculty positions in philosophy and religion were in jeopardy, and the university wanted to save faculty members involved.

Program After deans identified those who were vulnerable to layoffs, faculty members were given "probationary assignments." Following negotiations between faculty and the new department concerning the requirements for retraining, and the consent of the home department and the receiving department that any transfer would be accompanied by retention of tenure and rank, a faculty committee gave the proposed reassignments final approval. Assistance took the form of stipends for 75 percent of tuition and/or released time for semester or yearlong coursework within the university system.

Funding The Northwest Area Foundation supported Montana's retraining efforts. In the absence of funds marked specifically for retraining, the university now uses sabbaticals and leaves of absence to prepare faculty for other teaching positions.

Outcomes Three faculty members were retrained in other fields, namely, political science and computer science. In one case, a philosophy professor took over a political theory course, which relieved pressures to downscale the philosophy department while enabling the political science department to continue offering the theory course. According to the university's deputy commissioner for academic affairs, both the university and the faculty involved benefited from the reassignments and the additional flexibility, despite some departmental resistance.

For More Information Contact Carrol Krause, Acting Commissioner of Higher Education, the Montana University System, 33 S. Last Chance Gulch, Helena, Mont. 59620-2002, (406)444-6570.

State University of New York

Retraining Fellowship Program

Background The State University of New York is a large, multicampus system that enrolls almost 370,000 students and has 13,503 full-time faculty, of whom 68 percent are tenured. SUNY's first efforts at faculty retraining were supported by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. Between 1976 and 1979, 33 faculty were retrained under plans that involved support for tuition, released time, reduced teaching loads, relocation, and travel. In 1979, New York's collective bargaining agreement with the United University Professions for the first time provided state funds to be used for retraining for other employment faculty members who had been laid off or who had been notified of impending layoff. It also set up a labor management committee (now called the Continuity of Employment Committee) composed of four union representatives and four state representatives to administer the funds.

Program The current contract extends retraining benefits to employees that the Committee deems to be in "high-risk categories." It also gives the Committee the charge of studying faculty displacement and making nonbinding recommendations. Faculty members are encouraged to create their own retraining program. The application outlines the faculty member's current teaching responsibilities and the proposed course of study, including a schedule. The proposal is sent to the professional staff of the labor management committee; a subcommittee reviews it and makes recommendations to the full committee, which acts on the proposal. While the Committee does not dictate the content of retraining, proposals from faculty who have been retrenched or are "at risk" of retrenchment receive priority. The program supports retraining for other positions within SUNY or outside academia. Support includes tuition, which is keyed to SUNY graduate-level courses as a maximum, travel, room and board, books, and some extraordinary expenses.

Funding The current SUNY/UUP agreement provides $1.5 million in state appropriations over three years for the Committee's expenses for retraining activities.

Outcomes No formal comprehensive evaluation has been completed.

For More Information Contact Joyce Villa, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Labor Relations, State University of New York, State University Plaza, Albany, N.Y. 12246, (518)473-1864.

University of Wisconsin

Faculty Development Program

Background The University of Wisconsin enrolls more than 160,000 students on its 13 campuses. The university's faculty development program was created in the mid-1970s after five campuses had declared fiscal exigency and 88 tenured faculty had received layoff notices. The system now has 6,377 full-time faculty, more than 75 percent of whom are tenured. To avoid further retrenchment, the university obtained state funds and established systemwide guidelines for faculty development. Since 1977, each campus has been required to forge a two-year faculty development plan, which is continually updated and reviewed by the system office of academic affairs.

Program Each campus has its own procedures for selecting faculty retraining proposals, but typically the proposals are reviewed by a campus committee appointed by the vice chancellor for academic affairs. The proposals are then submitted to the system and reviewed for consistency with legislative intent and program guidelines. Proposals must describe the content of the retraining program, its rationale, its relation to the institutional faculty development plan, its cost, and the manner in which it will be evaluated. Tenured faculty normally receive preference over probationary faculty. Assistance may take the form of a full yearly salary for study at another institution, tuition reimbursement for courses within the system, released time, or support for travel and conferences. Although retraining plans rely on faculty initiative and voluntary participation, approval at the campus level is contingent upon the institution's needs (as specified in its faculty development plan). Both the home department and the receiving department must agree to any departmental transfer that results from faculty retraining.

Funding The program has a budget of $290,000 from the state. The current guidelines stipulate that only retraining and renewal activities qualify for support; that institutions must match system retraining funds one to one; and that renewal funds must be matched three to one by the campus.

Outcomes The systemwide program funds 40 to 50 faculty a year. According to the university's associate vice president for academic affairs, while the program has not been formally evaluated, it has improved faculty morale, strengthened academic programs, and eased personnel management.

For More Information Contact Dallas O. Peterson, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of Wisconsin System, 1604 Van Hise Hall, 1220 Linden Dr., Madison, Wis. 53706, (608)262-6410.

California State University at Long Beach

Faculty Retraining Project

Background California State University at Long Beach is a public institution that enrolls more than 31,000 students and has 840 full-time faculty. In 1978 California State University at Long Beach developed a faculty retraining program under the auspices of its Center for Faculty Development. The idea was to link faculty needs for professional opportunities with the university's needs for staffing in developmental studies (remedial instruction) and other introductory courses in which large numbers of part-time faculty had been involved. The university was concerned that dropping enrollment in highly-tenured areas such as history, the school of education, German, and philosophy would result in layoffs of tenured faculty.

Program The academic vice president, deans representing affected divisions, and the project coordinator, sought candidates for faculty retraining groups in composition and technical writing, American studies, religious studies, and sociology. Department chairpersons encouraged faculty members to participate. The 25 participants were given one-quarter released time for semester-length courses given by the university, with an understanding that they would be allowed to teach courses outside the department as needed as long as the new department agreed. The retraining took place over two semesters in the 1978-79 academic year.

Funding The chancellor's office and the office of the vice-president for academic affairs provided funds for faculty retraining activities.

Outcomes Of the 25 faculty trained, 16 were certified as acceptable to the receiving department, and 13 of the 16 subsequently taught from one to four semesters in the new areas. The program was not continued because enrollments in threatened departments rose. But in the interim, according to the project coordinator, the project gave the university greater flexibility and was a source of revitalization for faculty members. One spinoff was a retreat to encourage faculty to examine options within and outside academe.

For More Information Contact David Whitcomb, Counseling Center, California State University at Long Beach, 1240 Bellflower Blvd., Long Beach, Calif. 90840, (213)498-4001.

Cheyney University

Faculty/Staff Development and Training Program

Background Cheyney University is a public liberal arts and teacher training institution, a historically black campus that is part of the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education. It enrolls 1,500 students and has 147 full-time faculty, of which 97 percent are tenured. In response to the Adams decision ordering desegregation of higher education, Pennsylvania in 1983-84 appropriated enhancement funds for Cheyney, including funds for faculty training and retraining. The objectives were twofold: to increase the proportion of faculty holding doctorates, and to help shift Cheyney's heavily-tenured faculty, largely based in education and liberal arts, into the technical and business fields that are attracting more students.

Program Cheyney solicits applications from Ph.D. and non- Ph.D. faculty who propose to work toward a master's or a doctorate in high-demand areas identified by the university as developmental studies, computer science, economics, and business. The faculty member applies to the Office of Special Projects after being endorsed by an immediate supervisor and the vice president for academic affairs. The application describes the applicant's goals as they relate to the goals of the academic department and the university as a whole. Goals may include teaching outside the department, transferring to another department, or obtaining a dual appointment. Faculty who transfer retain their rank and salary. The application is reviewed by the director of the special projects office and the academic vice president, who send it to the director of equal education and employment opportunity within the State System of Higher Education. The program provides tuition reimbursement for graduate study toward a degree locally or elsewhere.

Funding The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has appropriated $500,000 over five years for faculty training and retraining at Cheyney.

Outcomes Nine faculty members are being supported to retrain from counseling and guidance to computer science, from sociology to business, from physics to electronics, from English to communications, and from history to economics. For academic year 1985-86, 26 faculty have been approved for the program. Twelve of the 26 are in Ph.D. programs; five Ph.Ds are being retrained; four are in master's degree programs, and the others are either preparing for a different academic program or are upgrading their skills in their present discipline.

For More Information Contact Roy Eikerenkoetter, Director of Graduate Studies and Special Projects, Box 364, Cheyney University, Cheyney, Pa. 19319, (215)399-2000.

City University of New York

University Faculty Development Program

Background In 1976, in the midst of New York City's fiscal crisis, the City University of New York laid off more than 3,000 faculty, or about 20 percent of its total faculty. The system, which enrolls about 180,000 students, and has about 7,000 full-time faculty, was left with a highly tenured (75 percent) faculty that bore little relation to the patterns of student enrollment. CUNY's University Faculty Development Program was established in the 1981-82 academic year through the collective bargaining agreement with the Professional Staff Congress, which represents faculty at the university's 17 colleges. According to CUNY, the objective was to provide retraining for faculty in disciplines of "currently diminished interest"--namely, the humanities--and prepare them to teach entry-level courses in areas of greater demand-- specifically, in computer science, data processing/ computer applications, and remedial instruction, such as basic writing. Today, the emphasis is no longer on retraining but on the renewal of faculty skills in teaching and research.

Program The program offers formal instruction in writing in the disciplines, computer assisted instruction, and computing in the humanities and social sciences. Particpants receive 3 or 4 hours of released time for each semester of study. A number of small individual grants are awarded for curriculum development projects. Applications are solicited by mail to all tenured and certified faculty, deans, provosts, and grant officers. Faculty applications for the instructional component must include agreements with the chairman of the home department, the academic dean, and the chairman of the receiving department that 1) the applicant can be released from teaching; 2) the college will provide released time; 3) and that he or she will be considered for teaching assignments after completing all program requirements and receiving the endorsement of program administrators that he or she is qualified to teach introductory courses. Applications for small grants include a detailed work proposal and must be approved by the department chairman and the academic dean or provost.

Funding CUNY's Office of Academic Affairs and participating colleges support the faculty renewal activities under the University Faculty Development Program.

Outcomes Since spring 1982, 140 faculty have taken one of the computer science, computer applications, and basic writing components, and many have gone on to teach in those areas. Several campuses have also launched their own retraining efforts. At Brooklyn College, for instance, to recruit faculty from other departments to teach computer science, the college awards stipends for training. Twenty-five who have completed the

training have taught introductory or advanced courses. At City College, with a Mellon Foundation grant, four faculty members have been trained to teach a computers and society course. The College of Staten Island since 1979 has provided released time to faculty to prepare them to teach in secondary areas, and awarded cash incentives to faculty chosen as mentors and those faculty wishing to gain expertise in computer science or remedial reading. At Bronx Community College, 50 faculty have participated in a retraining workshop, and 10 faculty have taught outside their primary specialty.

According to CUNY's academic dean, the retraining has been of immeasurable benefit in improving faculty morale and in reducing the numbers of adjunct faculty.

For More Information Contact Dean Richard Barsam, Office of Academic Affairs, The City University of New York, 535 East 80th St., New York, N.Y. 10021, (212)794-5423.

Kean College

Background Kean College is a public liberal arts and teachers college in Union, N.J. that enrolls about 13,000 students and has 359 full-time faculty, 77 percent of whom are tenured. Kean College's career development activities grew out of previous teaching improvement programs and an agreement with the state of New Jersey and the faculty bargaining agent, the New Jersey State College Locals. In 1980, enrollments were declining rapidly in the school of education and in history, while demand for computer science and business was climbing. The college decided that using adjunct faculty and encouraging retraining was desirable for economic and morale reasons. Beginning in 1983, the state agreed to provide funds to assist faculty in working toward an additional degree for retraining purposes. The college a year ago began a summer graduate training program in computer science and management science to prepare faculty to teach courses in those understaffed areas.

Program The faculty contract stipulates that bargaining unit members can receive tuition reimbursement for up to 45 credits over a lifetime at the college. Additionally, a career development program is administered by a committee composed of four faculty members and two persons appointed by the college president. The committee reviews applications for career leaves; the president determines whether to grant full or partial funding for the recommended proposals, based on the college's allocation of state funds. College support may include paid leave or released time, as well as tuition reimbursement and related expenses. The college commits its own funds for summer institutes in computer science and management science, under the guidance of the human resource development committee. Faculty members apply to the human resource development committee following discussions within their own department and the computer science or management science departments. Those who complete work in the institute are generally given (though not guaranteed) an entry-level section to teach in those areas. The college considers them on loan from the home department. Faculty who transfer to other departments retain their rank and salary. Approval for departmental transfers is obtained in advance of training from the president after consultation with the receiving department.

Funding The state allocated $30,800 in 1985 to Kean College for career development funds. The college has committed its own funds to supplement state appropriations and to support other training activities.

Outcomes To date, about 10 faculty have been retrained and transferred into areas of high student demand, such as accounting and computing. In 1984, 16 faculty members participated in the summer institutes, and all have taught or will be

teaching in new areas. Altogether, 50 faculty are prepared to teach outside their departments, and 60 have been trained to teach a new general education course. The college president feels retraining has given Kean the flexibility to meet changing student demands, as well as enhanced faculty job security.

For More Information Contact William Vincenti, Coordinator of Professional/Staff Services, Kean College, Union, N.J. 07083, (201)527-2000.

Northern Illinois University

Faculty Development Program

Background Northern Illinois is a public university located in De Kalb, Ill., with an enrollment of 23,500 and 1,200 full-time faculty, of whom 63 percent are tenured. Its faculty development program was created in 1981 as administrators foresaw tighter budgets and limited faculty mobility. The initiative, which became a full-fledged program in 1983, is designed to permit tenured faculty, at their instigation, to shift their specialization or change fields altogether. Program coordinators estimated that 10 percent to 12 percent of the tenured faculty would be likely candidates.

Program The decision to retrain rests solely with the faculty member, who works out the details of the plan with the faculty development office. The office is staffed by two faculty members part time --one of whom has participated in retraining-- and is situated apart from the university's other administrative offices. Over a four- to five-month period of negotiations with the individual faculty member, department chairpersons, deans, and the provost, faculty development staff help devise a formal agreement. The contract specifies plans for acquisition of new skills and the university's support, which may include partial released time, travel money, summer support, and tuition remission (or tuition to attend another institution, if needed). It includes a projected timetable; a statement of institutional need spelling out the courses the faculty member will be able to offer as a result of the retraining; provisions for monitoring faculty progress; provisions concerning evaluation, and financial arrangements. The contract contains an assurance that during the process of retraining the faculty member can return to the previous position without forfeiting tenure if the career change does not work out. It may include a commitment of service by the faculty member upon completion of the retraining plan.

Funding The university funds the program through the provost's office and commits about $100,000 per year. The department and college also contribute funds and in-kind resources, such as teaching assistants. Program coordinators estimate that the average cost per faculty ranges from $5,500 to $7,600 for a one-year plan to $16,000 to $27,500 for a three-year plan.

Outcomes Over the last three-and-a-half years, 40 faculty have negotiated "growth contracts" with the development office. Of those, nine have actually changed departments or are assuming new roles at the university. The rest have made "vertical shifts"-- say from the theoretical to the applied --

within their own disciplines. None has left the university. All have retained their tenure status. According to its directors, the program has benefited both participants and the university by providing new professional opportunities. They feel its success is attributable to high-level administrative support and to the cooperation of the involved faculty, departments, and colleges.

For More Information Contact Terry Oggel or Edwin Simpson, Faculty Development Coordinators, at Faculty Development Office, Williston 311, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Ill. 60115, (815)753-0595.

University of Tennessee at Martin

Academic Redirection Program

Background The University of Tennessee at Martin is a public institution that enrolls 5,696 students and has 207 faculty, of whom 87 percent are tenured. Faced in the late 1970s with the prospect of maintaining a highly-tenured faculty amid fixed budgets and changing student demand, the university decided to meet staffing needs as much as possible with existing faculty. In 1980, the university sought and obtained a grant from the U.S. Department of Education for its faculty "redirection" efforts.

Program Once academic officials, consulting with deans and department heads, had identified business, computer science, and other areas as those in greatest need for additional staff, the director of faculty and instructional development worked to identify faculty who were willing to retrain. He encouraged faculty from areas of declining demand, such as the school of education and some areas of the arts and sciences, to retrain to teach part of their load outside their department. The content of retraining was negotiated by the faculty member, the director of faculty and instructional development and the head of the receiving department. A formal letter of application setting forth the course of study and associated costs followed. The university supported all released time, tuition, and travel costs. Most courses of study were roughly a year in length.

Outcomes Through a combination of attrition, retraining, and hiring a few additional faculty, the university was able to meet its staffing needs and a commitment not to increase the total number of faculty members. Fifteen faculty participated in retraining activities, and almost all are now teaching in secondary areas. The Education Department grant ended in 1984; the university has continued to support retraining with internal funds. In the 1984-85 academic year, five faculty members were supported to retrain. The former director of faculty development attributes the success of the program to its voluntary nature and to the existence of a formal agreement between all affected parties.

Funding A yearly grant of about $30,000 from the U.S. Department of Education supported the academic redirection project from 1980 to 1984; since then, the university has committed about $10,000 a year to retraining activities.

For More Information Contact K. Paul Jones, Assistant to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Humanities 322B, University of Tennessee at Martin, Martin, Tenn. 38238, (901)587-7467.

Western Michigan University

Faculty Development Program

Background Western Michigan University is a public institution in Kalamazoo, Mich., that enrolls 18,500 students. The university has 750 full-time faculty, of whom 75 percent are tenured. In 1979 a committee of university officials and faculty bargaining agents concluded that in a time of academic retrenchment, shifting faculty from low-demand to high-demand areas was the preferred option. At that time, the university anticipated the elimination of 125 teaching positions, and twice identified faculty who possibly would be laid off. Targeted areas were the arts and sciences and library sciences.

Program Western Michigan University's Office of Faculty Development was established in 1981 as a part of the university's bargaining agreement with the American Association of University Professors. The current WMU-AAUP contract stipulates that the university offer and fund a program for all bargaining unit faculty to "orient, inform, retrain, upgrade, and renew the professional competencies of faculty." The program provides tuition subsidies for the 25 percent of fees not covered by the regular staff benefits policy, as well as additional support for individual retraining plans. Study at WMU and elsewhere is supported. In addition, the faculty development office, with matching funds from the departments and colleges involved, supports retraining activities in the form of institutes or seminars to give faculty greater expertise or to prepare for new teaching assignments, either within or outside their home departments. Often, once the approval of the dean is secured, the department chair applies on behalf of the faculty member. Applications are reviewed by the associate director of the office of faculty development and the vice-president for academic affairs on the basis of priorities identified by department chairs and deans.

Funding The vice-president for academic affairs oversees the faculty development office's budget of approximately $40,000, which supports faculty upgrading and retraining.

Outcomes Since 1981, a number of faculty have taken advantage of the tuition subsidy to retool. A humanities faculty member, for instance, is pursuing a master's degree in computer science; a philosophy professor is pursuing a degree in math. A faculty sharing program, in which the university encouraged faculty in underenrolled areas to teach in overenrolled areas, resulted in a few permanent shifts. In addition, 23 faculty have been retrained to teach in secondary areas through short courses, summer institutes and seminars. In all, the university estimates that 40 to 50 faculty now teach at least one course in another

department. The faculty response has been extremely positive, and the university has benefited in planning staffing needs.

For More Information Contact W. Jean Ramsey, Associate Director, Office of Faculty Development, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Mich. 49008, (616)383-1357.

Beloit College

Background Beloit is a private liberal arts college in Beloit, Wisconsin, with an enrollment of 1,064 students. In the late 1970s, 50 of Beloit's 125 faculty were retrenched due to a budgetary crisis. With gaps in some programs, such as foreign language, and the realization that the size of the faculty was not likely to change soon, the college sought to staff courses without adding new faculty. Accordingly, the college established a faculty development/faculty travel fund to assist faculty in developing expertise in new areas. In 1981, an endowed fund was created with a grant from the Hewlett and Mellon funds that was aimed at developing courses in high-priority areas (to be determined annually by the college) and preparing faculty to teach them.

Program Under the college's Hewlett-Mellon Fund, faculty are encouraged to apply for funding based on the announced priorities, which are determined jointly by the vice president for academic affairs and a faculty committee consisting of the heads of the three academic divisions — humanities, social science, and science. In 1984-85, for instance, proposals for the development of interdisciplinary courses, women's studies courses, computing courses, and basic writing courses took precedence. Support for released time, summer stipends, and on- or off-campus seminars is provided. The travel and development fund supports summer graduate study in approved areas, such as language retraining. In both cases, faculty committees screen the proposals; the vice-president for academic affairs or the college president makes the final decision.

Funding The Hewlett-Mellon Fund has an annual income of about $45,000. The college regularly budgets $30,000 for the faculty travel and faculty development fund.

Outcomes Fifty of Beloit's 75 faculty have participated in one of the programs. According to the vice-president for academic affairs, the programs have lifted faculty morale and productivity and enabled the college to develop new programs. Over the last five years, the projected enrollment decrease has been reversed, new faculty have been hired, and the need for retraining faculty has diminished.

For More Information Contact Frank Wong, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis. 53511, (608)365-3391.

College of St. Scholastica

Northwest Area Faculty Vitality Program

Background St. Scholastica is an independent, Roman Catholic liberal arts college located in Duluth, Minn. It has an enrollment of 1,307 full-time students, and 125 full-time faculty, of whom 62 percent are tenured. In 1979, with a grant from the Northwest Area Foundation, St. Scholastica established a retraining program designed to broaden the specialization of faculty members who had lighter teaching loads because of enrollment declines in their areas. St. Scholastica wanted to make better use of full-time faculty in high-demand areas, such as health sciences and business, and thus reduce the need for part-time faculty.

Program Under the Northwest Area Foundation grant, the college and participating faculty entered into formal agreements for retraining activities. A teaching payback of one year was required of all participants. Most of the training took place over the summer. The funds supported tuition, supplies, and transportation, as well as a prorated salary for the faculty member during the summer school session. One faculty member pursuing a doctorate received half his salary during the year.

Funding The Northwest Area Foundation provided a $62,500 grant. Since 1981, the Bush Foundation has supported faculty retraining activities, with matching funds from a $400,000 endowed fund the college built to continue faculty development programs.

Outcomes During the life of the Northwest Area Foundation grant, seven faculty members received training in fields ranging from speech to business administration, and five of the seven then taught courses outside their departments. In 1981, a standing faculty committee and the position of dean of faculty were established as part of a faculty development plan funded by the Bush Foundation. Since 1981, the Bush grant has supported faculty retraining activities to enable faculty to teach in a new subject area. The efforts now are largely geared at upgrading faculty within their departments so that the college can rely less on part-time faculty, although the college is supporting an English faculty member's study of computer science.

For More Information Contact Sister Joan Braun, Dean of Faculty, The College of St. Scholastica, 1200 Kenwood Ave., Duluth, Minn. 55811, (218)723-6036.

Mars Hill College

Background Mars Hill College is an independent, Baptist, liberal arts college in Mars Hill, N.C. It enrolls 1,481 students, many of whom are from the Appalachian region. In the early 1980s, in the aftermath of a substantial enrollment decline and layoffs of about 20 of the college's 105 faculty, Mars Hill decided to establish a program to stave off future faculty dislocations. The college decided that retraining faculty was preferable to letting them go. With help from the Exxon Education Foundation, the college, between 1983 and 1985, supported retraining efforts in three understaffed fields: gerontology, computer science, and fashion merchandising.

Program Under the Exxon grant, the college supplied tuition or fees, stipends, travel funds for participating faculty; it underwrote teaching replacements or a reduced teaching load for the summer session or semester. Faculty participation was generally voluntary. In some cases, college administrators encouraged faculty from then-overstaffed areas, such as chemistry, math, and social work, to participate in the retraining. Two chemists, for instance, were supported in their study of computer science; two social work faculty, who already had some background in geriatrics, were trained in gerontology.

Funding The Exxon Education Foundation provided $17,000. The college has recently received a grant from the Mellon Foundation to set up an endowment, with college matching funds, for faculty development.

Outcomes Nine faculty received "significant" retraining under the Exxon-supported program, which enabled the college to set up a gerontology program, establish a fashion merchandising program within the economics and business department, and to develop a combined business and computer science program. Income from the Mellon-supported endowed fund will be used strictly for faculty development in the arts and sciences. Guidelines for the Mellon program are still being drafted, but it is expected that small grants will be made for faculty and curriculum development projects, including retraining, on a competitive basis.

For More Information Contact Donald Anderson, Professor of Sociology, or Donald D. Schmeltekopf, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of Faculty, Mars Hill College, Mars Hill, N.C. 28754, (704)689-1111.

Mary College

Reeducation of Faculty Project

Background Mary College is an independent, Roman Catholic liberal arts college in Bismarck, North Dakota that enrolls about 1,100 students and has 60 full-time faculty. Faced with shifts in enrollment and overstaffing in some academic areas, Mary College in 1977 sought to "reeducate underutilized faculty." The college received a grant from the Northwest Area Foundation to retrain faculty in the arts and humanities to teach in understaffed fields such as business and accounting.

Program Over the three-year life of the grant, from 1979 to 1982, college administrators selected 26 faculty members either to prepare to teach in a secondary area, to develop expertise in an area of emphasis, or to train for administrative positions. With the exception of a musician who was preparing to teach an energy management course, participants were working in closely related areas; no departmental transfer was involved. Assistance to faculty took the form of released time for research, reduced course loads, and stipends for summer study and workshops.

Funding Support was provided by the Northwest Area Foundation.

Outcomes Currently, 12 faculty are prepared to teach in second disciplines, including composition, mathematics, Christian ministry, elementary education, communications, foreign languages, quantitative analysis, and basic computer science. Four acquired adminstrative experience, one administrator gained credentials as a workshop trainer, and two other staff members were trained in one of three areas of emphasis. Seven participants left Mary College for reasons unrelated to the retraining program. Project evaluators concluded that the project gave the college with a small faculty more flexibility in staffing and enlivened the faculty.

For More Information Contact Thomas P. Johnson, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Mary College, Bismarck, N.D. 58501, (701)255-4681.

Los Angeles Community College District

Background The Los Angeles Community College District enrolls more than 93,000 students and has 1,822 full-time faculty. In the early 1980s, the district was faced with changing student demand while staffing patterns remained the same. Planning staff targeted physical education, arts, theatre arts, music, history, sociology and psychology as areas in decline. Therefore, in 1984, a pilot program for faculty "retraining and updating" aimed at equipping physical education faculty to teach in other disciplines was created by the Office of Staff Development Programs and Services. The goal was to avoid retrenchment and prepare faculty to teach at least part of their load outside their department.

Program The director of the Office of Staff Development Programs and Services helps identify faculty willing to retrain and coordinates discussions with the faculty, campus vice president for academic affairs, and department chairs concerning the content and goals of retraining. Retraining may involve team teaching with a faculty mentor in the new subject area, taking courses to prepare to teach in an area of specified need, or full-time study in a university program to acquire credentials for subject fields in short supply. The plan must be approved by the district chancellor; then a formal agreement stipulating the course of study, scheduled completion, and requirements for verifying completion is signed. The district pays for tuition, books and materials for those who retrain on their own time, and, under a faculty bargaining agreement, provides released time, tuition, books, and material for faculty designated as retrainees.

Funding The community college district supports retraining activities out of its general funds, which include, by faculty contract, a $50,000 setaside for faculty tuition reimbursement.

Outcomes In the first year of the program, 18 faculty took courses in team teaching or attended a local university in preparation for new teaching assignments in mathematics, biology, English, finance, and real estate. Currently, 17 faculty members are participating in retraining, and many will move into new teaching assignments within a year. The program has been expanded to include some music faculty as well.

For More Information Contact Jerry Novotney, Director, Staff Development Programs and Services, Los Angeles Community College District, 617 West 7th St., Los Angeles, Calif. 90017, (213)628-7788.

Monroe Community College

Background Monroe Community College is a large public community college outside Rochester, N.Y. It has an enrollment of about 15,000 students and about 350 full-time faculty, of whom 90 percent are tenured. In the late 1970s, Monroe Community College experienced enrollment declines and potential overstaffing. In 1979, the college's agreement with the faculty bargaining unit (a New York State United Teachers and American Federation of Teachers affiliate) was expanded to include provisions for identifying departments that were potentially overstaffed two years in advance, notifying departments and individuals of possible layoffs or reassignments, and offering retraining programs to transfer faculty to departments in areas of greater need. Overstaffed areas included history, foreign language, and English.

Program Faculty who are identified for reassignment or layoff discuss the possibility of being reassigned with a faculty resources committee, the vice president for academic affairs, the home department, and the receiving department. Faculty must meet standards set for other faculty within the receiving department. The retraining plan is approved by the receiving department, the faculty resources committee, and the vice president for academic affairs. College support may include tuition reimbursement, released time of up to one quarter of the faculty member's workload, unpaid leave, and continued fringe benefits during a leave. Once a faculty member has completed retraining and has been endorsed by the receiving department and the vice president for academic affairs, the departmental transfer must be approved by the board of trustees.

Funding The college pays for tuition reimbursement and released time out of internal funds administered by the vice president for academic affairs.

Outcomes About 10 faculty have been retrained and reassigned to mathematics, chemistry, developmental education, business administration, sociology, and criminal justice. According to the college's vice president for academic affairs, the retraining program has not only eased the problem of overstaffing but has revitalized the areas in which the retrained faculty are teaching. Securing the cooperation of all affected parties has been integral to the program's success.

For More Information Contact Frank Milligan, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Monroe Community College, 1000 E. Henrietta Rd., Rochester, N.Y. 14623, (716)424-5200.

V. Institutional Policies, Contracts

Faculty Development Plan

Northern Illinois University

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

Preamble

The long range objective of the parties of this agreement (Professor of the Department of English; Professor , Chair of the Department of English; Professor , Chair of the Department of Computer Science; Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences; and University Vice President and Provost) is that will make a permanent career transition from his position as a tenured member with graduate faculty status in the Department of English to a position as a tenured member with graduate faculty status in the Department of Computer Science. This long range view of the ends should be borne in mind in all discussions of the means.

This document aspires to: 1) facilitate the realization of those ends by providing for the fair and reasonable means to realize them; and 2) to provide assurances to all principal parties that, if during or at the end of a reasonable trial or transition period Professor permanent relocation in the Department of Computer Science is undesirable to any party or parties, his return to his present Department of English position will be accommodated efficiently and with no prejudice against his or other parties.

Finally, it is imperative to bear in mind that, while it is clearly desirable to state as precisely as possible the means which will facilitate this transition, such a statement can never, by itself, produce a

successful program. Only a continued spirit of integrity, good will, openness, and mutual trust brought to bear on a common desire to make the transition succeed can do that. This document also aims, therefore, to promote the maintenance of that essential spirit.

Program of Study

To prepare himself for the professorial duties in the Department of Computer Science, Professor , in consultation with appropriate members of that department, will complete the following program of course work.

Provisions

1. Three years (ending in May 19) are to be considered the period of transition for Professor career shift. At the end of this period (fall semester, 19) a final disposition of the various aspects of a permanent relocation (tenure, increment, rank, and graduate faculty status) must be made.

   a. If at that time (May 19), either Professor or the Department of Computer Science objects to the transition, Professor will return to his full-time position in the Department of English. (It is likely that objections to the permanent shift would be raised well before this date and if they do, an earlier return to the Department of English would, of course, be clearly desirable and warranted and should occur immediately, with the understanding that the ordinary time of return to the Department of English would be between spring and fall terms; it would not be

at mid-year (in January) unless Professor specifically agrees.)

b. If at that time (May 19) all parties are agreeable to the shift, a special tenure transfer process shall take place (since tenure is not being granted anew, but is being transferred). The Chair and the Personnel Committee of the Department of Computer Science will inform the Dean of their recommendation(s) to tenure Professor in their department; the Dean will pass his/her recommendation to transfer tenure, along with the Department's decisions, to the Provost, who will transmit these three positive decisions along with his/her own recommendation to transfer tenure to the President. The President will recommend to the Regents that tenure be transferred. In this manner the Board of Regents will make final, formal approval of the permanent shift. (Since only the first of these steps, at the Department level, includes the judgment of a personnel body, that body must be kept apprised of the progress of this shift during the three years' transition period. It is the responsibility of the Chair of the Computer Science Department to keep them so informed.)

c. During this transition period, Professor annual salary increment will be fixed at the average increment percent of the university, without regard for rank.

d. Rank during the transition period will remain as it is at

present in the Department of English--Assistant Professor. The first opportunity for promotion will occur in the fall of 19 , at the same time as the decision for permanent transfer of tenure.

e. It is understood that in the fall of 19 , when the tenure decision is made, assuming that that decision is to recommend that tenure be transferred, and when the first promotion opportunity occurs (cf. 1d above), Professor will enter the Department of Computer Science's annual personnel review process as a regular faculty member. At this time he will be reviewed for graduate faculty membership. At this time his research, teaching and service will be evaluated in accordance with the standard personnel review procedures of the Department of Computer Science.

f. During the transition period, Professor will acquaint himself with the internal workings of the Department of Computer Science and will as soon as possible, but certainly by spring semester 19 , be available for some service, perhaps in such areas as undergraduate advising and curriculum review. As with all other aspects of professional responsibility, eventually Professor will merge himself into the Department of Computer Science and will be fully available in the area of department, college and university professional service.

g. To assist the Department of Computer Science and Professor

in realizing this shift as smoothly and with as much mutual understanding as possible, and so that all parties may be kept abreast of the progress of this transition, a semi-annual review of Professor work in teaching (and research, if relevant) will be conducted each year during the transition period by the Chair of the Department of Computer Science with the assistance of such members of the regular department faculty as the Chair deems appropriate. This review is to take place in May and November of each year, beginning in May of 19 , and should incorporate a personal conference and a written report. Confidential copies of the written report should be sent to all parties named herin, and to the University's Faculty Development coordinators. Opportunity should be allowed for Professor to append any remarks which he has concerning each report; such comments, if there are any, should accompany the department's report when it is sent to all concerned parties. Although these reports will not constitute a regular faculty service evaluation of Professor during the transition period, they will assist all parties in monitoring the progress and, more importantly, will provide a strong body of evidence on which to make the final decisions regarding tenure, promotion, graduate faculty status, and annual increment recommendations when the period of transition is over. No principal party should be in the dark about how matters are going during these three years.

h. At first, Professor will teach lower division courses;

as he demonstrates the necessary skills he will begin to teach upper division undergraduate courses. It is to be hoped that by fall semester of 19 , if not sooner, he will have demonstrated sufficient skills to teach graduate courses in the spring of 19 .

2. a. Since a person moving into a new discipline will become qualified sooner in the areas of teaching and service than in the area of research and publication, in the years following the end of the transition period the Department of Computer Science will apply to Professor those standards applicable to an individual fresh from graduate school in the area of research and publication during the annual review process. Professor will be expected to progress in this area as would a beginning faculty member.

   b. Although he will progress in the area of research and publication as befits a member of the Department of Computer Science beginning in the years following the end of the period of transition, Professor , it should be borne in mind, has already established a record of research and publication in English. The work he has produced during his "first career" in English should continue to be recognized by personnel committees in the future.

3. Effective as of the spring semester of 19 , after Professor has been recommended to become a tenured member of the Department of Computer Science, he will receive a salary adjustment to bring his

salary up to the level of the average of the assistant professor rank in the Department of Computer Science.

4. In recognition of the large amount of effort expended already in this redevelopment program as a result of his own initiative, Professor shall receive a salary adjustment of $200/month effective fall semester 198 . In the event that Professor transfer to the Department of is not accomplished, this adjustment will be terminated immediately.

5. Professor will begin teaching full-time (2 courses per semester) in the Department of in the spring of 198 . He will be offered at least a half teaching load during the summers of 198 and 198 ; a full-time teaching load will be offered if possible, depending on availability of courses.

6. Professor will be allowed the option of taking additional course work during the summers of 198 and 198 in lieu of teaching to make his replacement into the Department of by the fall of 198 more assured. To allow him to take these courses, funds for two months' salary for each summer will be provided by the Office of the Vice President and Provost.

University of Wisconsin

General UW System Guidelines for Faculty Retraining and Renewal Proposals

Since the inauguration of the faculty renewal and retraining phase of the UW System's faculty development program, a number of interpretations, statements, policies, and procedures have developed. The paper is an attempt to bring these scattered bits of information into a single, useful guideline document.

It must be remembered at the outset that the UWS does not have a free hand in the way in which faculty development funds are to be used. The Legislature defines the conditions which must be observed and if we are to expect continued support for this vital program, we must respect legislative intent. Thus, faculty development funds may be expended only in support of:

1. Retraining - Development of scholarly resources of faculty members in fields of study allied to those in which they have their primary academic preparation in order to increase the ability of institutions and units to adapt to changing curricular, student, and societal needs. Retraining proposals are eligible to receive matching funds from the System faculty development account on the basis of an equal match by institutional funds. (ACPS 3.1)

2. Renewal - Continued development and renewal of the expertise of faculty members in their fields of primary academic preparation in order to increase the ability of institutions and units to adapt to changing curricular, student and societal needs. Renewal proposals are eligible to receive one-quarter funding from the System faculty development account if matched by three-quarter institutional funding. (ACPS 3.1)

In 1977, each institution was required to develop a two-year plan for faculty development to meet its mission requirements and academic program and staff needs in response to ongoing academic program planning activities, including programmatic reviews and their recommendations, and in response to anticipated demands of students, society, and scholarship as identified in the institution's Ten-Year Academic Plan. The institutions are to review and update their faculty development plans every two years and submit them to the Office of Academic Affairs; thus on December 1, 1979, the first updated plans were supposed to be submitted to Academic Affairs. The current update of institutional faculty development plans was submitted December 1, 1983.

The Academic Affairs office uses the following guidelines based on ACPS 3.1 to review the institutional plans. The outline of the guidelines is not intended to serve as a required format for the faculty development plans, but does provide a summary of those major elements that appear to be essential to any effective plan.

Following the institutional faculty development plans, developed for 1984-85 and 1985-86, the next step in the process is the submission of specific implementation proposals to Academic Affairs. Although ACPS 3.1 calls for the development of broad based faculty development effort, the Legislature currently limits, as noted earlier, the use of System funds for retraining and renewal proposals. Each institution has established its own procedures leading to the selection of faculty proposals to be submitted to the System for funding. Proposals submitted for consideration at the System level must contain a paragraph abstract of the proposal and the following elements:

NEW

1. Who is the faculty member involved.

2. What the retraining or renewal program will consist of in detail.

3. Where the activity will take place and why it must occur there.

4. Why the projected program is necessary.

5. How the program relates to the institutional faculty development plan, especially how it will increase the ability of the institution and unit to adapt to changing curricular, student, and societal needs.

6. How much the program will cost and the source of funds.

7. How will the program be evaluated.

At the System level institutional proposals will be evaluated on how well they fit within the institution's faculty development plan and on the following criteria. The criteria is not arranged in priority order.

1. Is institutional need defined?

2. Does the program clearly address identified needs?

3. Does the proposal answer the question of who will do what, when, where, why, how and at what cost?

4. Are evaluative criteria built into the proposal?

5. What is the institutional priority ranking?

6. Is the proposal achievable within the time frame proposed?

7. What institutional fiscal constraints exist?

8. Will the proposal lead to an enhancement of individual and institutional resources?

9. How does the quality of the proposal being evaluated compare to that of the others under consideration?

January 1 is the deadline for submission of proposals that are scheduled for the following academic year.

Specific UW System Guidelines for Faculty Retraining and Renewal Proposals

The overall philosophy behind the faculty retraining and renewal program should be to minimize the fiscal implications to the participant thereby encouraging rather than discouraging participation in the program. While each institution has its own guidelines, procedures, and protocols, there are a number of more specific System guidelines that individuals should be aware of as they draw up their proposals.

1. By definition the program is limited to the faculty as defined in Chapter UWS 1.04. Academic staff who have been granted faculty status by the chancellor and faculty governance body are not eligible to submit faculty retraining and renewal proposals. (Chapter UWS 1.05)

2. Only proposals which fit the definition of faculty retraining or faculty renewal are eligible at this time for consideration for funding under the program. Institutional faculty development programs may fund programs in other areas, but the legislation which established the present faculty retraining and renewal program prevents System Administration from funding such efforts.

3. Because the faculty retraining and renewal program is viewed as an important tool in developing institutional instructional flexibility, tenured faculty will normally receive preference over probationary faculty for System funds. Programmatic considerations may override this preference, however.

4. Proposals designed to meet needs identified in the institutional faculty development plans will receive a higher priority than those that are unrelated to these expressed needs. Therefore, it is incumbent on the institutions that their faculty development plans clearly determine institutional needs.

5. System faculty development funds will not be used to support faculty proposals whose primary object is to allow an individual to complete a terminal degree.

6. Proposals may request matching funds for salary support of faculty members at the option of the institution. Unless there are extenuating circumstances (i.e., an activity available only during the summer), such salary support will be available only during the academic year. Faculty retraining and renewal funds may not be used as a means of providing a source of summer income for faculty members.

7. Proposals may contain requests to pay for fees and tuition for courses at accredited institutions that the faculty member takes as part of a retraining or renewal program. A faculty member may also request support to pay for registration fees, participation fees, etc., at professional workshops, seminars, institutes, etc. Retraining proposals may contain request for funds to buy course related books and supplies.

8. Proposals may contain requests for travel funds within three categories. If the faculty member is within commuting distance, a reasonable amount to cover commuting expenses may be requested. Second, if the location of the program is beyond commuting distance, a faculty member may request one round trip to the location during the period of the project. Other trips must be paid for by the participant. Thirdly, funds for travel may be requested if it can be demonstrated that such travel is a critical component of the retraining or renewal project.

9. If the retraining or renewal program takes place at a location beyond commuting distance from the faculty member's home, living expenses may be requested. However, institutional policies may limit the amount granted if the faculty member is also receiving a salary.

10. Support for travel to and attendance at professional meetings may be requested, if it can be shown that such participation is a required part of the individual's retraining or renewal program. System faculty development funds cannot be used in place of institutional travel money for attendance at professional meetings.

Specific institutional policies may be more restrictive than the above System guidelines, but faculty may not go beyond these guidelines when submitting proposals for System faculty retraining and renewal funding.

October, 1984

Kean College

GUIDELINES FOR CAREER DEVELOPMENT FUNDING

I. Eligibility

All faculty and non-teaching professionals in the unit are entitled to apply for Career Development funds.

II. Deadlines for Application

Individuals must submit applications to the Career Development Committee in care of Mr. William Vincenti, T-128. Applicants will be notified of the Committee's recommendations within thirty (30) days of the following deadlines:

November 15, 1984
December 6, 1984
February 7, 1985
March 14, 1985
April 11, 1985

III. Eligibility Priorities

As funds are limited, all proposals will be evaluated according to need and merit. The Committee will observe the following order of priorities in deciding which proposals to recommend for funding:

1. Those who have been through the A-328 process and have been found deficient.

2. All others who have been through the A-328 process within the last two years.

3. Tenured faculty and non-probationary professionals who have not been through the A-328 process.

4. Non-tenured faculty and probationary professional employees who have not received reappointment conferring tenure or a multi-year contract if they have received reappointment for the year following their application, subject to the proviso that their eligibility be proportionate to the limited nature of their reappointments.

IV. Funding Priorities

It is intended that Career Development funds should be awarded to people in the following categories:

1. Those interested in developing skills in a new disciplinary or administrative area especially needed at Kean College.

2. Those interested in improving or diversifying and extending their teaching or administrative skills and knowledge.

3. Those interested in increasing their skills in their present discipline or administrative area.

V. Career Development and Assistance Programs*

Career Development may include, but is not limited to, the following types of assistance:

1. Career Development Leaves up to two (2) consecutive years.

   Career Development Leaves not exceeding one-half of the academic year in duration shall be at the rate of three quarter (3/4) salary. Career Development Leaves exceeding one-half (1/2) salary or at the rate of employee's salary less $7552, whichever is greater. No employee shall receive a rate of less than $12,594 per annum under this program.

2. Released time for research study and participation in other aspects of the Career Development Program.

3. Financial Support of Direct Expenses.

   Travel, lodging, and other costs related to participation in seminars, workshops, or other external programs that are part of your Career Development Program.

4. Tuition Reimbursement.

   Tuition charges to be incurred as part of a Career Development Program may be included. Tuition expenses associated with a Career Development Leave are not subject to the limitations of the regular Tuition Reimbursement plan and may be reimbursed fully.

VI. Post Program Report

It is a condition of accepting an award of Career Development funds that upon completion of the program a report shall be made detailing the activities and results attained. The purpose of the report is to assist the Career Development Committee in deciding upon proposals in subsequent years.

VII. Reimbursement Information

Reimbursement will be made as soon as possible after receipts and refund requests for completed approved programs or activities are passed on to the Career Development Committee, in care of Mr. William Vincenti, T-128.

*In accordance with existing State rules and regulations

From the Agreement Between Western Michigan University and the W.M.U. Chapter of the American Association of University Professors

ARTICLE 37. - FACULTY DEVELOPMENT POLICY

Section 1: FACULTY DEVELOPMENT. Western offers a Faculty Development program which has been established to facilitate faculty and institutional renewal, to increase the possibilities for professional development, and to provide for a fuller utilization of faculty resources. Faculty Development activities are intended to orient, inform, retrain, upgrade, and renew the professional compentencies of faculty.

Section 2: OFFICE OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT. The Vice President for Academic Affairs or his/her designee is the Director of Faculty Development and administers the Office of Faculty Development. The Associate Director is appointed by the Director in consultation with the AAUP. The Associate Director is a member of the bargaining unit who is reassigned from his/her usual workload responsibilities.

The Office of Faculty Development encourages, coordinates, and facilitates professional development for bargaining unit faculty through a variety of services and activities, which have included such offerings as tuition subsidies for courses at Western, workshops and career counseling.

Section 3: FACULTY DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE. The Faculty Development Advisory Committee consists of five (5) bargaining unit members, selected from a list of ten (10) nominees recommended by the AAUP, and five (5) administrative members. The membership is appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs or his/her designee, and the Committee is chaired by the Director or his/her designee. The Advisory Committee recommends Faculty Development policy, programs, and activities, and advises the Director.

Section 4: ELIGIBILITY. All bargaining unit faculty are eligible to participate in all Faculty Development programs, subject to the conditions established by the Director and to the resources of the Office of Faculty Development.

Section 5: FUNDING. Western agrees to provide a level of funding for the Office of Faculty Development which permits the maintenance of a Faculty Development program.

ARTICLE 44. - PERMANENT INTERDEPARTMENTAL TRANSFER PROCESS

Section 1: TRIAL ASSIGNMENT IN NEW DEPARTMENT. A tenured or tenure-track bargaining-unit faculty member who is under consideration for a permanent transfer from one academic department to another shall be given a trial assignment in the new department. Permanent transfer consideration may be initiated by the faculty member or by Western, and these permanent transfer procedures shall be effected upon mutual agreement of the faculty member and Western, after consultation with the bargaining-unit faculty of the receiving department.

The conditions for approved trial assignments are:

A. Length: The trial assignment shall be for two (2) or three (3) years.

B. Salary: The trial assignment shall be at the faculty member's salary at the time of transfer plus any contractually-mandated increases.

C. Rank: The assignment shall be at the faculty member's rank at the time of transfer, and the faculty member shall not be eligible for promotion during the trial assignment.

D. Departmental Membership: The faculty member shall remain a member of his/her original department during the trial assignment.

E. Stipulations: Both prior to the trial assignment and after the first year review but prior to the second year of the trial assignment, the departmental faculty may recommend and Western may stipulate what the faculty member must accomplish during the trial assignment in order to be recommended for permanent membership in the new department. All such stipulations shall be directly related to the criteria specified in Article 17, Tenure and to Appendix D.

F. Reviews: The faculty member shall be reviewed by the new department in at least the first and last year of the trial assignment.

G. Return to Original Department: With Western's approval, the faculty member may be returned to his/her original department at the end of any semester during or at the end of the trial assignment. Return may be initiated by the faculty member or by Western.

H. Continuous Service: Continuous service of the bargaining-unit faculty member shall not be affected by interdepartmental transfer.

I. Modification: The above conditions may be modified by mutual agreement of the bargaining-unit faculty member, Western and the AAUP.

Section 2: PERMANENT ASSIGNMENT IN NEW DEPARTMENT.

A. New Departmental Membership Decision: In the case of a tenured faculty member, at the end of the trial assignment, the departmental bargaining-unit faculty shall recommend whether the faculty member shall be granted permanent membership in the new department. If the faculty member is granted permanent membership in the new department by Western, the faculty member shall become a permanent member of the new department and shall no longer be a member of the original department. A tenured faculty member shall retain his or her tenure throughout the transfer process.

In the case of a tenure-track faculty member, at the end of the trial assignment, the departmental faculty shall make a recommendation of whether the faculty member shall be granted permanent membership in the new department. The final tenure review of the faculty member shall be conducted by the new department in the last year of the trial assignment - or later, if so stipulated prior to the trial assignment. A tenure-track faculty member may only be recommended for tenure when he/she has had a positive membership recommendation.

B. Rank: The faculty member shall not have his/her rank reduced by permanent transfer to the new department.

C. Promotion Eligibility: At the start of the trial period, Western shall stipulate the number of years-in-rank with which the new faculty member shall be credited for purposes of promotion eligibility in the new department. Based on the years-in-rank credit, the faculty member is eligible for promotion in the new department after becoming a permanent member of that department.

D. Salary: The faculty member's salary shall not be reduced because of permanent transfer to the new department.

E. Service on Committees: Departments may make recommendations to Western (through their Departmental Policy Statements) concerning the rights of faculty members transferred under this provision to serve on departmental committees during the trial period and after obtaining permanent membership.

ACE Board of Directors

Executive Committee

Philip H. Jordan, Jr., President
Kenyon College, *Chair*

Frank H. T. Rhodes, President
Cornell University, *Vice Chair*

Ronald W. Roskens, President
University of Nebraska, *Immediate Past Chair*

Joyce S. Tsunoda
Chancellor for Community Colleges
University of Hawaii, *Secretary*

Robert H. Atwell, President
American Council on Education

Stelle Feuers, President
Los Angeles City College

Janet D. Greenwood, President
Longwood College

Edward T. Foote II, President
University of Miami

Association Representatives

Margaret W. Bridwell, M.D.
Director of the Health Center
University of Maryland

Robert V. Cramer, President
Carroll College

Judith S. Eaton, President
Community College of Philadelphia

Brother Patrick Ellis, F.S.C., President
La Salle University

Carol J. Guardo, President
Rhode Island College

Stephen Horn, President
California State University, Long Beach

Ellis E. McCune, President
California State University, Hayward

Luna I. Mishoe, President
Delaware State College

The Rev. Michael G. Morrison, S.J., President
Creighton University

John W. Ryan, President
Indiana University System

Kenneth G. Ryder, President
Northeastern University

John S. Toll, President
University of Maryland

Theodore Ziolkowski, Dean
The Graduate School
Princeton University

Class of 1986

Alfredo G. de los Santos Jr.
Vice Chancellor for Educational Development
Maricopa Community Colleges

Harold W. Eickhoff, President
Trenton State College

Stelle Feuers, President
Los Angeles City College

Stanley O. Ikenberry, President
University of Illinois

Eamon M. Kelly, President
Tulane University

Betty Lentz Siegel, President
Kennesaw College

Class of 1987

Roscoe C. Brown, Jr., President
Bronx Community College
City University of New York

William M. Fulkerson, Jr., President
Adams State College

Janet D. Greenwood, President
Longwood College

William J. Maxwell, President
Jersey City State College

Patsy H. Sampson, President
Stephens College

James J. Whalen, President
Ithaca College

Class of 1988

Robert L. Albright, President
Johnson C. Smith University

David W. Breneman, President
Kalamazoo College

Edward T. Foote II, President
University of Miami

William P. Gerberding, President
University of Washington

Bruce E. Whitaker, President
Chowan College

Brunetta R. Wolfman, President
Roxbury Community College

2/6/86